

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Entry of this Amendment under Rule 116 is merited as it raises no new issues and requires no further search.

Claims 2-5 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form including all limitations of base claim 1. Claims 2-5 have also been amended to improve claim language without otherwise touching the merits. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

The Examiner's repeated 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 1-5 as being obvious over *Reynolds* in view of *Pawlikowski* are noted.

Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 for the reasons advanced in the last Amendment, i.e., for lack of an adequate and objective suggestion or motivation to combine the references. The rejection of claim 1 is also traversed because the references as combined by the Examiner would not teach or disclose all limitations of claim 1, i.e., a metal blade (10a, 10b) **formed in one piece** with said track (7a, 7b) of said circuit (3).

*Pawlikowski* teaches an electric terminal made from a single sheet metal piece bent in a L shape and adapted to receive in a snap-in manner the naked conductive ends of electrical insulated wires. After all the wires to be cabled have been fitted, the terminal is **soldered** to receiving contacts 52 of a printed circuit (see Fig. 3 of *Pawlikowski*). Thus, *Pawlikowski* neither teaches nor suggests a metal blade/terminal formed integral in one piece with a corresponding track of a printed circuit, as claimed in claim 1. The shaped metal terminal/blade of *Pawlikowski* is formed as an independent and separate element with respect to tracks 52 c, and then is joined to the latter by soldering or the like. Accordingly, the terminals in the Examiner's combined device would be connected electrically and mechanically to the tracks of the printed circuit, but would NOT be formed in one piece with the tracks. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 1 is therefore inappropriate.

Claim 1 has nevertheless been canceled solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution.

The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 2-5 are traversed for the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1. The rejections of claims 2-5 are also traversed because the references as combined by the Examiner would not teach or disclose all limitations of claim 2, i.e., a slot (11a, 11b) having **cutting edges** (13', 13", 13', 14") for cutting said insulating sheath. According to the present invention, an insulated wire is simply inserted in the slot of the blade without the necessity of precutting the insulating sheath. The cutting edges of the present invention cut the insulating sheath to an extent sufficient to establish electric contact between the blade and the conductive core of the wire and, simultaneously, the cut wire is retained in the slot.

*Reynolds*, on the contrary, teaches (*see*, e.g., column 4, lines 40-48) providing a plate terminal which does not require cutting the insulating sheath. The insulating sheath is removed by *displacement*, rather than by cutting, because the sheath is squeezed between edges 6, 6', and 8, 8' of the terminal that have precisely chosen different dimensions and elements 80, 80' and 81, 81' of a mounting tool. *Pawlikowski* does not teach cutting edges, either. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 2 is therefore inappropriate and should be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claim 3 is traversed for the reasons advanced with respect to claims 1 and 2. The rejection of claim 3 is also traversed because the references as combined by the Examiner would not teach or disclose all limitations of claim 3, i.e., semicircular seat (12a, 12b) which is formed **at the vertex** of the V defining said groove. In FIG. 6 of *Reynolds*, the "seat" at the vertex of "V shaped" groove 2 is elongated rather than semicircular as presently claimed.

Accordingly, all claims in the present application, namely, claims 2-5 are clearly in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including

extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP

Benjamin J. Hauptman  
Registration No. 29,310

  
By: Randy A. Noranbrock  
Registration No. 42,940

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Telephone: (703) 684-1111  
Facsimile: (703) 518-5499  
Date: July 22, 2003